4860P2436 Patent

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 52-72 were pending. Claims 52, 56, 61, 65, and 70 have been amended. Claims 53, 57-58, 62, 66-67, and 71-72 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 52, 54-56, 59-61, 63-65, and 68-70 remain pending.

Claims 52-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,506) in view of Quick, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,506, hereinafter Quick) and further in view of Schneier ("Applied Cryptography, Second Edition, Protocols, Algorithms, and Source Code in C", John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1996, hereinafter Schneier). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 52 as amended sets forth:

the access point sending the encrypted channel key to the station to cause the station to terminate the setup connection and to establish a secured connection with the access point using the channel key.

(Claim 52 as amended; emphasis added)

In contrast, none of Lewis, Quick, and Schneier, teaches the above limitation. The Office Action argued that Lewis teaches the above limitation, citing col. 9, ln. 24-40 of Lewis (Office Action, p. 5, second paragraph). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action. According to Lewis, *the key distribution server 76* provides the ENCRYPT key encrypted using the MASTER key to the requesting mobile terminal 66. The access points 54 in Lewis do *not* provide the ENCRYPT key to the requesting mobile terminal 66. Thus, Lewis does not teach the access point sending the encrypted

09/659,864 Page 10 of 12

4860P2436 Patent

channel key to the station to cause the station to terminate the setup connection and to establish a secured connection with the access point using the channel key.

Furthermore, neither Quick nor Schneier, alone or in combination, make up the deficiencies of Lewis. Quick discloses that it is not necessary that the terminal and home system exchange passwords nor session keys in encrypted form (Quick, col. 4, ln. 29-31). Furthermore, if the password is not included in the message, even in encrypted form, then, according to Quick, it is more difficult to be compromised (Quick, col. 4, ln. 36-37). Schneier discloses Hughes encryption scheme (Schneier, p. 515). Neither Quick nor Hughes teaches that an access point sends the encrypted channel key to the station to cause the station to terminate the setup connection and to establish a secured connection with the access point using the channel key.

Because none of Lewis, Quick, and Schneier, alone or in combination, teaches the access point sends the encrypted channel key to the station to cause the station to terminate the setup connection and to establish a secured connection with the access point using the channel key, claim 52 as amended is patentable over Lewis in view of Quick and Schneier. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 52, claims 56, 61, 65, and 70 are patentable over Lewis in view of Quick and Schneier. Claims 53-55, 59-60, 62-64, and 68-69 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 52, 56, 61, and 65, respectively, and thus, are patentable over Lewis in view of Quick and Schneier. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

09/659,864 Page 11 of 12

4860P2436 Patent

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a)(3), Applicant hereby requests and authorizes the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted, BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_578\_\_, 2009

Chui-kiu Teresa Wong Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 48,042

1279 Oakmead Parkway Sunnyvale, California 94085 (408) 720-8300